

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.

615 214-6301

Suite 2101

Fax 615 214-7406

Guy M. Hicks General Course

333 Commerce Street

Nashville, Tennessee 37201-3300

April 13, 2000

## VIA HAND DELIVERY

David Waddell, Executive Secretary Tennessee Regulatory Authority 460 James Robertson Parkway Nashville, TN 37238

Re:

Contested Cost Proceeding to Establish Final Cost Based Rates for

Interconnection and Unbundled Network Elements

Docket No. 97-01262

Dear Mr. Waddell:

Enclosed are the original and thirteen copies of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.'s response to the Staff's Data Request of April 10, 2000. Copies of the enclosed are being provided to counsel of record for all parties.

Very truly yours,

ουγ Μ. Hicks

GMH:ch Enclosure



BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Docket No. 97-01262 TRA's Data Request April 10, 2000 Item No. 1 Page 1 of 3

Request:

Can BellSouth derive geographically deaveraged UNE rates for at least three (3) zones from the results of the TELRIC Calculator Model for Tennessee?

Response:

As AT&T has previously observed, BellSouth's TELRIC Calculator does not generate loop costs on a geographically deaveraged basis. See AT&T's Motion In Limine, at 5 (filed February 17, 1998). Nevertheless, it is possible to derive geographically deaveraged loop rates for at least three (3) zones from the results of BellSouth's TELRIC Calculator. However, because the loop costs determined by the TELRIC Calculator are based on a sample statistically valid only at the state level, another cost model must be utilized to develop the ratios of the zone costs to the average statewide costs. AT&T has previously objected to such an approach, insisting that introducing another model "in this proceeding as the basis for establishing de-averaged loop rates would substantially prejudice the parties ...." See Id. at 6. AT&T apparently has had a change of heart, however. As evidenced by its March 31, 2000 filing in this docket setting forth AT&T's proposed rates, it appears that AT&T has embraced BellSouth's cost studies completely and totally abandoned its Hatfield Model as the basis for establishing rates in this proceeding. Thus, if BellSouth's TELRIC Calculator is to be used to establish rates for unbundled loops in Tennessee, another cost model other than Hatfield must be used to develop the ratios for geographic deaveraging purposes, notwithstanding AT&T's prior objections to such an approach.

For Tennessee, BellSouth advocates the Federal Communications Commission's ("FCC's") Hybrid Cost Proxy Model ("HCPM") and the national inputs as proposed by the FCC. In its Ninth Report and Order; Forward-Looking Mechanism for High Cost Support for Non-Rural Carriers (Dockets 96-45 and 97-160), the FCC selected the HCPM as the "model of choice" for use in determining high cost universal service support. In its Tenth Report and order in those same dockets, the FCC further defined input value for use in the HCPM.

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Docket No. 97-01262 TRA's Data Request April 10, 2000 Item No. 1 Page 2 of 3

Use of the HCPM should not be construed as BellSouth's endorsement of the model, its output results, or the input values, particularly with respect to determining the cost of unbundled network elements. While BellSouth would have preferred to use the Benchmark Cost Proxy Model ("BCPM"), the Authority has not decided whether to adopt BCPM for purposes of determining the level of universal service support. As a result, HCPM is an appropriate mechanism to develop the ratios for geographic deaveraging.

As stated earlier, ratios must be developed in order to deaverage the statewide rates for the various unbundled loops at issue. The process is relatively straightforward:

- Develop loop costs by wire center using the HCPM and FCC inputs.
- 2) Partition the wire centers in Tennessee into rate groups based upon the General Subscriber Tariff. BellSouth believes the use of rate groups more closely reflects geographic differences than the process of arbitrarily ranking wire centers. Additionally, rate groups maintain communities of interest that have been established over time.
- 3) Classify rate groups into one of three zone designations.
- 4) Calculate the average monthly cost per loop in each zone.
- 5) Compare the zone average cost as determined by the HCPM to the state average as determined by the HCPM cost to determine the ratio.
- 6) Apply the ratios to the statewide UNE rates to deaverage the costs into zones.

•			

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Docket No. 97-01262 TRA's Data Request April 10, 2000 Item No. 1 Page 3 of 3

Listed below are the results of this process:

Zone 1 (Rate Groups 4 & 5): 88.42% of the statewide average Zone 2 (Rate Group 3): 115.48% of the statewide average Zone 3 (Rate Groups 1& 2): 151.00% of the statewide average

Applying these ratios to the statewide loop rates BellSouth has proposed the Authority adopt results in the following deaveraged loop rates:

		TENN	ESS	SEE				
		Zone	<b>1</b>	Zo	ne 2		Zone 3	
	Statewide	200				T		
UNE LOOPS (Recurring Rates)	Loop Rate <sup>1</sup>	88.4	2%	11	5.48%		151.00%	
2-wire analog voice grade loop - service level 1	\$ 17.00	\$ 15	.03		19.63	\$	25.67	
2-wire analog voice grade loop - service level 2	\$ 21.34	\$ 18	.87		24.64	\$	32.22	
4-wire analog voice grade loop			.03	<u> </u>	36.61	\$	47.87	
2-wire ISDN digital grade loop			.31	<u> </u>	33.06	\$	43.23	
2-wire asymmetrical digital subscriber line (ADSL) compatible loop			.74		20.56	\$	26.88	
2-wire high bit rate digital subscriber line (HDSL) compatible loop	\$ 13.95	\$ 12	.33	\$ 1	16.11	\$	21.06	
4-wire high bit rate digital subscriber line (HDSL) compatible loop	\$ 17.82	\$ 15	.76	\$ 2	20.58	\$	26.91	
4-wire DS1 digital loop	\$ 74.17	\$ 65	.58	\$ 8	35.65	\$	112.00	
4-wire 56 or 64 kbps digital grade loop	 \$ 39.93	\$ 35	.31		6.11	\$	60.29	

## Zone Make-up

Zone 1 (RG4-5) = Nashville, Knoxville

Zone 2 (RG3) = Clarksville, Jackson

Zone 3 (RG1-2) = Columbia, Cumberland City

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Statewide loop rates from BellSouth's 3/31/00 rate proposal.

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on April 13, 2000, a copy of the foregoing document was served on the parties of record as indicated:

Mail Facsimile Overnight	Richard Collier, Esquire Tennessee Regulatory Authority 460 James Robertson Parkway Nashville, TN 37243-0500
[ ] Hand [√Mail [ ] Facsimile [ ] Overnight	Henry Walker, Esquire Boult, Cummings, et al. 414 Union Ave., #1600 P. O. Box 198062 Nashville, TN 39219-8062
[ ] Hand [ V Mail [ ] Facsimile [ ] Overnight	Dana Shaffer, Esquire NEXTLINK 105 Malloy Street, #300 Nashville, TN 37201
[ ] Hand [ ☑ Mail [ ] Facsimile [ ] Overnight	Erick Soriano Kelley, Drye & Warren 1200 19th St., NW, #500 Washington, DC 20036
[ ] Hand [ ] Mail [ ] Facsimile [ ] Overnight	James Wright, Esq. United Telephone - Southeast 14111 Capitol Blvd. Wake Forest, NC 27587
[ ] Hand [ √ Mail [ ] Facsimile [ ] Overnight	Jon Hastings, Esquire Boult, Cummings, et al. 414 Union St., #1600 Nashville, TN 37219
[ ] Hand [ Y Mail [ ] Facsimile [ ] Overnight	Val Sanford, Esquire Gullett, Sanford, Robinson & Martin 230 Fourth Ave., N., 3d Fl. Nashville, TN 37219-8888

[ ] Hand [ Mail [ ] Facsimile [ ] Overnight	
[ ] Hand [ Mail [ ] Facsimile [ ] Overnight	
[ ] Hand [ ] Mail [ ] Facsimile [ ] Overnight	
[ ] Hand [ ] Mail [ ] Facsimile [ ] Overnight	
Hand Mail Facsimile Overnight	
Hand Mail Facsimile Overnight	

Vincent Williams, Esquire Office of the Attorney General Consumer Advocate Division 426 Fifth Ave., N., 2nd Fl. Nashville, TN 37243-0500

Don Baltimore, Esquire Farrar & Bates 211 Seventh Ave., N., #320 Nashville, TN 37219-1823

Charles B. Welch, Esquire Farris, Mathews, et al. 205 Capitol Blvd, #303 Nashville, TN 37219

Kenneth Bryant, Esquire Trabue, Sturdivant & DeWitt 511 Union St., #2500 Nashville, TN 37219-1738

William C. Carriger, Esquire Strang, Fletcher, et al. One Union Square, #400 Chattanooga, TN 37402

James P. Lamoureux AT&T 1200 Peachtree St., NE, #4068 Atlanta, GA 30367

